

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-5 and 7-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments merely address 35 U.S.C. §112 issues; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary, because the amendments overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections, thus narrowing the issues for appeal. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Ngo during the August 25, 2004 personal interview. Applicants are particularly appreciative that Examiner Ngo agreed to conduct the personal interview after a Final Rejection. Applicants incorporate a separate record of the substance of the interview into the following remarks. Specifically, Applicants amend claims 1-11 to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions regarding the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections.

The Office Action objects to claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §132. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection.

As agreed during the August 25, 2004 personal interview, the objection has been rendered moot by Applicants' amendment to claim 8.

The Office Action objects to the title as not descriptive. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection.

As discussed during the November 20, 2003 and August 25, 2004 personal interviews and in the November 21, 2003 Amendment, Applicants submit that the title is adequately descriptive. The invention recited in the claims describes a method of manufacturing image display medium and an image display medium, and the title describes the preamble of each independent claim. Furthermore, the title cannot be more descriptive of the invention without becoming excessively long and complex. Because the title is adequately descriptive, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as non-enabling. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As agreed during the August 25, 2004 personal interview, on page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 25, for example, Applicants' specification at least discloses that color material particles may be attached to one or both of the substrates by using an electric field, screen printing, blade coating, roll coating, spray coating, gap coating, bar coating, and/or gas coating to hold the particles to either one or both of the substrates. A number of other methods are also disclosed throughout Applicants' specification (see, e.g., pages 23-26). While the particles are held to one or both of the substrates, or maintained on one or both of the substrates, the substrates are fixed together (page 3, lines 9-19; see also page 22, line 19 to page 27, line 23 for a detailed discussion of how the substrates are fixed).

Because, as agreed during the August 25, 2004 personal interview, Applicants' disclosure, at the time the application was filed, would have taught one skilled in the art how to maintain a plurality of color material particles distributed on at least one of the two substrate while superimposing one of the two substrates onto the other of the two substrates,

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9 are enabled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As agreed during the personal interview, the rejection is rendered moot by Applicants' amendment of claims 1 and 7, which more clearly identifies the substrates. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 7, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 6,154,265 to Kamino et al. (hereinafter "Kamino"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Kamino does not disclose disposing a plurality of color material particles on at least one of the two substrates, as recited in claims 1, 7, and 12. As discussed during the August 25, 2004 personal interview, the color filters 125 of Kamino are formed by curing an ink (comprising the dye alleged by the office action to be equivalent to Applicants' claimed color material particles) receptive liquid resin to form solid rectangular color filter panels (col. 46, lines 6-22; col. 46, lines 63 - col. 47, lines 6; col. 39, lines 5-12; column 61, lines 15-27).

However, even if the dye disclosed in Kamino can be considered colored material particles, Kamino still fails to disclose disposing a plurality of color material particles on at least one of the two substrates, as recited in claims 1 and 7. In each of the embodiments disclosed in Kamino that specifically address the dye and the ink used to color the color filters, the dye is converted into ink or liquid resin, by being mixed with a solvent or dissolved in a liquid resin, before being disposed on the substrate (see, e.g., column 61, lines 15-27 and column 48, line 25 - column 49, line 21). As such, if the dye could be considered particulate, the particles making up the dye are dissolved to form a liquid ink before being deposited on the substrate. The fact that the ink disclosed in Kamino is not particulate is

the July 23, 2003 Office Action. The arguments presented in response to the July 23, 2003 Office Action were the grounds of traversal that the Applicants chose to assert and those remarks do not indicate or imply any sort of admission by Applicants that they were the only available grounds of traversal.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/tea

Date: August 26, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--